

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) over U.S. Patent No. 5,415,573 to Chen et al. (hereinafter "Chen"). For the following reasons the rejection is respectfully traversed.

Regarding claim 1, Chen does not teach "a second guide member having a taper face for guiding the printed circuit board toward the chassis in response to sliding the printed circuit board in the longitudinal direction while *the longitudinal direction (of the circuit board) is parallel to the side edge of the chassis.*"

In the Office action, the Examiner responds to Applicants' previous argument by asserting that "Chen et al. teaches the board being slid into the receptacle in a direction parallel to the chassis, see figure 1." Applicants respectfully point out that claim 1 requires not only that the sliding direction is parallel to the chassis, but that it is parallel to a side *edge* of the chassis. This requirement is not shown by Fig. 1 of Chen.

The Examiner cites the housing referred to in the abstract of Chen for teaching a chassis. It is presumed that this is the same structure as the housing (20) described in the specification of Chen with reference to Fig. 1. The direction of insertion is clearly shown and described in Chen with reference to an arrow "A" shown in Fig. 1 (column 6, lines 9-13). Applicants can see no side *edge* of the housing (20) that is parallel to the arrow "A". Rather, the insertion direction shown by the arrow "A" appears to be parallel only to the angled surfaces (40), which have been cited by the Examiner for teaching the tapered face of the second guide member in claim 1.

Applicants submit that the edges of the angled surfaces (40) are not side edges of the housing (20). The "side edges," as the terms are used in claim 1, of the housing (20) are the edges of the *sides* of the housing (e.g., the left side, the right side), not the edges of the internal structures of the housing (20), such as the guiding blocks (28) on which the angled surfaces (40) are located. In other words,

Appl. No. 09/980,239
Amdt. Dated February 12, 2004
Reply to Office action of December 1, 2003

claim 1 does not merely require that the sliding and longitudinal direction of the printed circuit board be parallel to *any* edge located on or within the chassis, but that it be parallel to a *side edge* of the chassis. The disclosure of Chen does not satisfy this requirement. Since every limitation is not taught by Chen, claim 1 is not anticipated. Thus, claim 1 and its dependent claims 2-5 are patentable over Chen.

Regarding claim 6, Chen does not teach "a second guide member connected to the chassis and having a horizontal guide face and a second taper face," as required. Since every limitation of the claim is not taught, claim 6 is patentable over Chen.


Regarding new claim 7, Chen does not teach a second guide member having a "horizontal guide face being adapted for guiding the printed circuit board in a direction parallel to the *side edge* of the chassis." The Examiner has not stated what structure in Chen is considered to be the "horizontal guide face" of claim 6. Nevertheless, Applicants respectfully submit that, for the reasons explained above with respect to claim 1, there is no teaching of guiding a printed circuit board (16) in a direction parallel the side edge of the chassis. Thus, there is no structure in Chen which can meet the limitations of the horizontal guide face of claim 7. Since every limitation of the claim is not taught, claim 7 is patentable over Chen.

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. 34207.

Respectfully submitted,

PEARNE & GORDON LLP

By:


Aaron A. Fishman, Reg. No. 446827

1801 East 9th Street
Suite 1200
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108
(216) 579-1700

Date:

2/12/04